

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Subgroup
History Record

FAA Control # 97-01-182
(Originally Charting Portion issue 97-01-093)

SUBJECT: Charted Fixes on SIAPs that Have No Apparent Purpose.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: Some SIAPs, primarily at airports with control towers but limited radar coverage, have alternate missed approach procedures that appear only on the source 8260-3/5. ALPA has previously raised the issue of informing pilots where such alternative non-vectored missed approach procedures are authorized and to even provide the secondary missed approach in a textual form separate from the approach chart. ALPA has become aware of some approach charts that have the secondary missed approach procedure's terminus fix charted on the approach chart without any stated purpose or explanation.

RECOMMENDATION: This requirement reinforces ALPA's view that secondary missed approach procedures that appear on the 8260-3/5 should be made available to the pilot in a form that will not complicate or compromise the charted primary missed approach procedure. A charting spec needs to be developed so that the pilot is fully in the loop with the controller. Receiving a verbal description of a full-route, alternate missed approach procedure over the air while setting up for the approach is, itself, an unacceptable workload item.

COMMENTS: This recommendation affects SIAP charting specifications and Order 8260.19C.

Submitted by Captain Tom Young, Chairman
Charting and Instrument Procedures Committee

AIR LINE PILOTS ASSOCIATION

PH: (703) 689-4205
FAX: (703) 689-4370
March 6, 1997

INITIAL DISCUSSION (Meeting 97-01): New issue, transferred from the Charting Portion, presented by Wally Roberts, ALPA. Using the VOR or GPS RWY 6 approach at Napa, CA as an example, Wally noted that there is a fix (DYKEE) that is charted in the plan view, yet has no apparent procedural use for the approach. Discussion revealed that DYKEE is the alternate missed approach fix and it is not published on any other chart. Alternate missed approach instructions are not charted, but issued by ATC when necessary. It was noted that having the fix and its associated makeup and holding pattern published on the chart provides pilots a visual depiction of the fix and negates the necessity of ATC verbally describing the fix makeup and issuing detailed holding instructions. ALPA prefers that a separate section of the TPP booklet be devoted to alternate non-radar missed approach instructions even though this may impact on charting specifications. **ACTION: AFS-440 and ATA-130.**

Following are excerpt from the minutes of the Charting Portion meetings regarding Issue 97-01-093

ACF 97-01: *This was transferred from the Instrument Procedures group. Secondary missed approach procedures exist at a few airports and the IAP has this secondary MAP terminus fix charted, without an explanation of the missed approach procedure itself. This causes confusion in the cockpit about what the terminus fix means and why it is charted. From a charting perspective, this is clutter that should be removed. Mr. Terry DePlois, FAA/AVN-160, stated that they would look at the example used (Napa Valley VOR/GPS RWY 6) to determine why the fix was on the chart. If there was no rationale given/determined, then the fix could be removed. ACTION: FAA/AVN-160.*

ACF 97-02: *Transferred back to the Instrument Procedures Group. Closed.*

MEETING 97-02: Status unchanged. Issue was not worked due to higher priority taskings and staffing constraints. **ACTION:** AFS-440 and ATA-130.

MEETING 98-01: Mike Werner, AVN-160, briefed that the issue has arisen once or twice in the past year. AVN will QC alternate missed approach procedures and only publish those fixes specified by ATC. Jim Terpstra, Jeppesen, and Wally Roberts, ALPA, jointly noted that most of these fixes are to satisfy air traffic control requirements, when in many cases, ATC could easily use a fix that is already charted. Hal Becker, AOPA, emphasized that from a human factors standpoint, seeing the fix depicted on a chart was preferable to having it described verbally. And, as noted at a previous meeting, having the fix and holding pattern charted precludes the controller having to issue detailed instructions thereby reducing pilot/controller workload. Jim Terpstra again emphasized not charting fixes solely used as alternate missed approach fixes; the better solution was to design alternate missed approach instructions to terminate at a currently published en route fix. The overall group consensus was to chart alternate missed approach fixes and holding patterns. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI) recommended closing the issue and letting the Charting Group decide charting methodology. The group agreed. **ISSUE CLOSED.**

Editor's Note: *Review of the ACF, Charting Portion minutes indicates no subsequent activity on the issue.*